

REMARKS

Claims 1, 9, 10, 14, 15 and 20 are being amended. Claims 4, 12, and 18 have been cancelled without prejudice. No new matter has been added.

Reexamination and reconsideration of the action are requested in light of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Interview Summary

The applicant thanks Examiners Le and Pham for the courtesy of an in-person interview on March 22, 2007. The applicant's representatives, Hans Troesch and Arrienne Lezak, thank the examiners for their time, which was greatly appreciated. The applicant argued that the Fritz reference does not teach generating a derived context as recited in the claim. No agreement was reached.

Section 102 Rejections

Claims 1-3, 9, 10-11, 14, 15-17 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,134,552 ("Fritz").

Claim 1. Claim 1, as amended, recites "defining a sequence of contexts, . . . each successive context in the sequence of contexts being derived from the preceding context in the sequence of contexts by application of one of the maps."

The examiner rejected claim 1 stating that Fritz discloses a method where a context is generated by one or more successive applications to the entry context of one or more successively selected maps. The applicant disagrees with the examiner's characterization of Fritz; however, for the sake of argument, even if Fritz discloses application of a map to an entry context, the portions of Fritz relied upon by the examiner do not disclose that an output context of one application of a map is used as input to another successive application of a map, as recited in claim 1. Moreover, Fritz does not disclose that a sequence of contexts defined in this fashion, with respect to the entry context and the maps, is used to select a PHIO, as recited in claim 1.

For these reasons, the applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 as well as claims 2-4 and 9, which depend from claim 1, are in condition for allowance.

Claim 10. Claim 10 is a claim directed to a computer program product with limitations corresponding to those of claim 1. The applicant respectfully submits that claim 10 and its dependent claims are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons given above in reference to claim 1.

Claim 15. Claim 15 is a claim directed to a system with limitations corresponding to those of claim 1. The applicant respectfully submits that claim 15 and its dependent claims are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons given above in reference to claim 1.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the applicant submits that all the claims are in condition for allowance.

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the examiner, the applicant does not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the applicant's arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist.

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 26 Apr 07

/Hans R. Troesch/
Hans R. Troesch
Reg. No. 36,950

Customer No. 32864
Fish & Richardson P.C.
Telephone: (650) 839-5070
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071